

Applic. No. 10/603,962  
Amdt. dated February 25, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 26, 2004

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-20 are now in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 20 has been added. Claims 5 and 10 were previously cancelled.

In item 1 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-3, 6-8, and 13-17 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Saiz (U.S. Patent No. 6,082,668) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

As will be explained below, it is believed that the claims were patentable over the cited art in their original form and the claims have, therefore, not been amended to overcome the references.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

a second zone on a rear surface adjacent the front surface, wherein the second zone is faired and streamlined, formed by two surfaces and hollow, which does not generate lift and wherein the profile reduces drag and substantially reduces separation of the boundary layer.

The Saiz reference discloses a fuselage having a nose that is inclined upward for creating major lift and a tail that is inclined downward to exploit suction in order to create major lift (column 1, lines 15-27).

The reference does not show a second zone on a rear surface adjacent the front surface, wherein the second zone is faired and streamlined, formed by two surfaces and hollow, which does not generate lift wherein the profile reduces drag and substantially reduces separation of the boundary layer, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Saiz reference explicitly discloses that the tail is inclined downward to create major lift. Saiz is completely silent about streamlining, reducing drag, and reducing the separation of the boundary layer. Saiz does not disclose that a second zone on a rear surface is faired and streamlined so that it does not generate lift. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which a second zone is provided on a rear surface adjacent the front surface, wherein

the second zone is faired and streamlined, formed by two surfaces and hollow, which does not generate lift wherein the profile reduces drag and substantially reduces separation of the boundary layer.

The Examiner is respectfully reminded that 35 U.S.C. §102(b) requires that the present invention must be fully described in the reference. The Saiz reference is completely silent about an aerodynamic profile that is streamlined, reduces drag, and reduces the separation of the boundary layer.

Based on the above provided comments it is seen that Saiz does not anticipate the present invention as claimed.

Since independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 2-3, 6-8, and 13-17 are believed to be allowable as well.

The following remarks pertain to new claim 20.

Claim 20 calls for, *inter alia*:

at least two wings each having a respective front surface being inclined at a positive angle for generating lift.

The reference does not show at least two wings each having a respective front surface being inclined at a positive angle for generating lift, as is recited in claim 20 of the instant application. The Saiz reference discloses that the front surface of the wing is inclined at a negative angle (Fig. 4). Saiz does not disclose a front surface of a wing that is inclined at a positive angle. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which at least two wings each have a respective substantially planar front surface that is inclined at a positive angle for generating lift.

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office action, claim 4 has been rejected as being obvious over Saiz (U.S. Patent No. 6,082,668) in view of Loeding (U.S. Patent No. 2,503,585) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Loeding does not make up for the deficiencies of Saiz. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claim 4 is believed to be allowable as well.

In item 3 on page 2 of the Office action, claims 9, 11, and 12 have been rejected as being obvious over Saiz (U.S. Patent No. 6,082,668) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 9, 11, and 12 are believed to be allowable as well.

In item 4 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 18 and 19 have been rejected as being obvious over Saiz (U.S. Patent No. 6,082,668) in view of Saiz (U.S. Patent No. 6,378,803) (hereinafter "'803") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The '803 reference does not make up for the deficiencies of Saiz. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 18 and 19 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 20. Claims 1 and 20 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-20 are solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Applic. No. 10/603,962  
Amdt. dated February 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of August 26, 2004

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of 3 months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$510 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

 R.# 29,854  
For Applicant(s)

RMS/akd

February 28, 2005

Robert M. Schwartz, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101